2. The reference teaches attaching a cable to the source signal (i.e. at point A in FIG 2) in order to connect the source signal to the display device (i.e. at Input 2). Aside from the degradation caused by the cable (making it impossible to use this signal as a reference), this presents an additional problem – attaching anything to the source signal, such as a cable at point A in FIG 2 will degrade the original signal. It should be noted that the sited reference is a simulation that does not account for this fact. In a real physical world, this action will degrade the source signal even before it is evaluated for degradation by the circuit. (In contrast, the present invention is based on avoiding introduction any additional degradation to the source signal due to evaluation for degradation).

II. CLAIMS 3-4 SHOULD NOT BE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103 BECAUSE IT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS TO MODIFY THE REFERENCE (ELECTRONIC WORKBENCH) TO ACCOMPLISH THE INVENTION OF CLAIMS 3-4

Applicant hereby incorporates by reference the argument against rejection of claims 1-2 above. Claims 3-4 are dependent on claims 1-2. Since Electronic Workbench is not available as reference for claims 1-2, rejection of claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is improper. Further, even if the reference (Electronic Workbench) is modified to substitute a video signal (claim 3) or NTSC, PAL, SECAM or computer signal (claim 4), such modification will still leave direct connection of the source signal (i.e. Sine Wave 1) which is not degraded by the circuit (i.e. Low Pass Filter) to the display device (i.e. Oscilloscope) for comparison with the source signal degraded by the circuit (i.e. Degraded Sine Wave 1). Therefore, it would not have been obvious for one of ordinary